

## REMARKS

Claims 1, 9-11, and 19-24 are pending and under consideration. In the non-final Office Action of December 11, 2007, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 9-11, and 19-24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being anticipated by *Tracton, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,470,378)* (“*Tracton*”) in view of *Fields, et al. (U.S. 6,412,008)* (“*Fields*”) and further in view of *Colby, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,862,624)* (“*Colby*”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and address the Examiner’s disposition below.

Claims 1, 11, 21, and 24 have each been amended to claim that the request message is analyzed to detect a minimum client characteristic included in a header information part of the request message.

Independent claims 1, 11, 21, and 24, each as amended, each claim subject matter relating to determining to download a web page to a client responsive to receiving a request message from the client to download the web page. A client capability of the client is obtained from a source other than the client responsive to the determination. The request message is analyzed to detect a minimum client characteristic included in a header information part of the request message. The content of the web page is adapted to be compatible with the obtained client capability and the minimum client characteristic. The web page is downloaded with the adapted content to the client. The web server retrieves the client capability from a local secondary storage on the web server.

In an illustrative example, a web server obtains information about a client’s browser settings from a database in the web server’s secondary storage prior to downloading the web page to the client. The web page is adapted to be compatible with the browser settings and a detected minimum client characteristic.

This is clearly unlike *Tracton* in view of *Fields* and further in view of *Colby*, which fails to disclose or suggest adapting a web page to be compatible with an obtained client capability as well as a minimum client characteristic, which is detected in a header information part of a request message from a client. As acknowledged by the Examiner, *Tracton* fails to disclose this claimed subject matter. *Office Action of 12/11/07*, page 3. The Examiner argues that *Fields* 2:47-55 teaches this claimed subject matter. Applicants disagree. Nowhere does *Fields* 2:47-55, let alone anywhere in *Fields*, teach or suggest analyzing the header information part of a request message to determine a minimum client characteristic. This is simply not discussed in *Fields*.

*Colby* also fails to disclose or suggest this claimed subject matter. Therefore, *Tracton* in view of *Fields* and further in view of *Colby* fails to disclose or suggest claims 1, 11, 21, and 24.


Claims 9, 10, 19, 20, 22, and 23 depend directly or indirectly from claims 1, 11, or 21 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claims 1, 11, and 21 are allowable.

Applicants respectfully submit the rejection has been overcome and request that it be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that claims 1, 9-11, 19-24 are patentable. It is therefore submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

 (Reg. No. 45,034)

Christopher P. Rauch  
SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP  
P. O. Box 061080  
Wacker Drive Station - Sears Tower  
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080  
Telephone (312) 876 8000  
Customer No. 58,328